

S/N 09/915,403

Response to Office Action Dated 02/24/2006

REMARKS

A review of the claims indicates that:

- A) Claims 13 and 14 remain in their original form.
- B) No claims are currently amended.
- C) Claims 1—3, 7—12 and 15—19 are previously presented.
- D) Claims 4—6 and 20—28 were previously cancelled.

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Traversal of the §102 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 10 and 12 were rejected under §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,078,936, hereinafter "Martin." In response, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Traversal of Rejection of Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a client computer device comprising:

- a user interface having a visual display unit;
- at least one communications port for communicating between the client computer device and a plurality of printer devices;
- driver means for driving said printer devices, wherein the driver means are adapted to request a first print preview of a print job from a first printer device, and to request at least a second print preview of the print job from at least a second printer device, wherein the first print preview represents a first preview of the print job as printed on the first printer device, and wherein the second print preview represents a second preview of the print job as printed on the second printer device, wherein the second printer device is configured differently than the first printer device, such that the first print preview differs from the second print preview; and
- browser means for displaying, within the user interface, the first print preview and the second print preview to a user, so as to enable the user to select at least one of the first printer device and the second printer device to print the print job.

S/N 09/915,403

Response to Office Action Dated 02/24/2006

1 As an initial observation, the Applicant submits that the Martin reference
2 does not disclose a driver adapted to request a preview from a printer device.
3 Instead, the previews are simulated *by the processor on the workstation* operated
4 by the user. In particular, Figs. 9 and 11 show how a single processor 102 or 186
5 creates the examples output images 106—108 (Fig. 9) to a display 104 or 192 in a
6 manner that simulates how they would look if output by the different output
7 devices 194—196 (Fig. 11). Thus, Martin discloses that the print previews are
8 generated centrally by a CPU device in the workstation.

9 Accordingly, Martin does not disclose requesting a “print preview of a print
10 *job from a first printer device*” (or a second preview from a second printer device).
11 Accordingly, Martin does not disclose utilization of the RIP (raster image
12 processing) facilities on the printers. For a general discussion of such utilization,
13 see the Applicant’s specification at page 7, lines 9—12, and more generally page
14 7, lines 5—20, and other locations.

15 The Patent Office suggests that Martin discloses requesting print previews
16 from a printing device. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

17 A careful reading of Martin discloses that a processor develops the print
18 previews within the workstation, utilizing the central processor 102 and/or 186.
19 (See Martin at column 12. lines 12—20.) Such a configuration is seen in Figs. 9
20 and 11.

21 Accordingly, Martin does not disclose a client computer wherein the driver
22 is configured for communication request of print previews generated by two or
23 more printers. In response, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section
24 102(e) rejection be withdrawn.

25

S/N 09/915,403

Response to Office Action Dated 02/24/2006

1 **Claims 2 and 3** depend from Claim 1 and are allowable due to their
2 dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for
3 their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in Claim 1, are
4 neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in
5 combination with one another.

6 **Traversal of Rejection of Independent Claim 10**

7 **Claim 10** recites a method of generating a plurality of print previews of a
8 print job as provided by a plurality of different printers, said method comprising
comprising:

- 9 • **requesting a first print preview of the print job from a first**
10 **printer;**
11 • **requesting at least a second print preview of the print job from at**
12 **least a second printer, wherein the second printer is configured**
13 **differently from the first printer, such that the second print preview is**
14 **different from the first print preview, wherein the first and second**
15 **print previews take into account specific settings and characteristics of**
16 **the first and second printers;**
17 • **displaying the first print preview and the second print preview of said**
18 **print job to a user; and**
19 • **enabling the user to select the first printer or at least the second printer**
20 **to print the print job based on the first and second print previews.**

21 As an initial observation, the Applicant submits that the Martin reference
22 does not disclose requesting print previews from a printer. The response to the
23 rejection of Claim 1 is hereby incorporated by reference herein. Instead, Martin
24 discloses that a local processor prepares the print previews, which are shown on a
25 monitor of sufficient resolution, thereby allowing the user to select the desired
printer for the print job. In particular, Martin discloses that the print previews are
generated by the processor (e.g. see column 12, lines 13—20). Accordingly, print
previews are not requested from the printers.

S/N 09/915,403

Response to Office Action Dated 02/24/2006

1 Accordingly, Martin does not disclose a method wherein print previews are
2 requested from at least two printers. In response, the Applicant respectfully
3 requests that the Section 102(e) rejection be withdrawn.

4 **Claims 11—19** depend from Claim 10 and are allowable due to their
5 dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for
6 their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in Claim 10,
7 are neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in
8 combination with one another.

9 **The §103 Rejections**

10 Claims 7—9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable
11 over Martin in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,285,461, hereinafter “Fujii”. In response,
12 the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

13 **Traversal of the §103 Rejections**

14 **Claim 7** recites a system, wherein “at least two of the printer devices being
15 configured differently from one another, wherein the preview generation means
16 of a first one of said two printer devices generates a first print preview for the
17 print job, and wherein the preview generation means of at least a second one of
18 said two printer devices generates a second print preview for the print job,
19 wherein the first print preview is different from the second print preview”.

20 As seen in the discussion of the Martin reference with respect to the Section
21 102 rejections, Martin does not teach or suggest “preview generation means” within
22 a printer device. Instead, Martin teaches a centralized processor that generates the
23 print previews, such as is shown in Figs. 9 and 11. To avoid repetition of argument,
24 the Applicant incorporates the discussion of Martin seen above at this location.
25

S/N 09/915,403

Response to Office Action Dated 02/24/2006

1 The Fujii reference was cited by the Patent Office as teaching a plurality of
2 computing devices. Fujii was not cited as teaching or suggesting preview
3 generation means of a printer that generates a print preview. Moreover, Fujii fails to
4 teach such print preview generation in a printer. Accordingly, Fujii fails to remedy
5 the failure of Martin. Therefore, the combination of Martin and Fujii fails to teach
6 or suggest a preview generation means of a printer that generates a print preview of
7 the print job. In response, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103
8 rejection be withdrawn.

9 Claims 8—9 depend from Claim 7 and are allowable due to their
10 dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for
11 their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in Claim 7, are
12 neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in
13 combination with one another.

S/N 09/915,403

Response to Office Action Dated 02/24/2006

Conclusion

The arguments presented above are intended to present the Applicant's position clearly, but should not be considered exhaustive. Accordingly, the Applicant reserves the right to present additional arguments to clarify the Applicant's position further. Moreover, the Applicant reserves the right to challenge the status as prior art of one or more documents cited in the Office Action.

The Applicant submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowability be issued. If the Patent Office's next anticipated action is not the issuance of a Notice of Allowability, the Applicant respectfully requests that the undersigned attorney be contacted to schedule an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 4-6-06By: 

David S. Thompson
Reg. No. 37,954
Attorney for Applicant

LEE & HAYES PLLC
Suite 500
421 W. Riverside Avenue
Spokane, Washington 99201
Telephone: 509-324-9256 x235
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979